

**LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO**

Dale K. Galipo, Esq. (SBN 144074)  
dalekgalipo@yahoo.com  
Cooper Alison-Mayne (SBN 343169)  
cmayne@galipolaw.com  
21800 Burbank Boulevard, Suite 310  
Woodland Hills, CA 91367  
Phone: (818) 347-3333

**RUBIN LAW OFFICE, P.C.**

David Rubin (SBN 304744)  
david@rubinlawoffice.com  
2292 Faraday Avenue, Suite 100  
Carlsbad, CA 92008  
Phone: (619) 719-1087

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

URSULA BYRAM, S.B. by and  
through guardian *ad litem* TIMOTHY  
BYRAM, N.B. by and through  
guardian *ad litem* TIMOTHY  
BYRAM, and A.B. by and through  
guardian *ad litem* KAITLYN  
HUMENCHUK, individually and as  
successors-in-interest to Everett  
Byram,

Plaintiffs,

v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES,  
BLAKE RUNGE, and BRENDA  
ALCANTARA,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:23-cv-9285-KS

**JOINT SCHEDULING  
CONFERENCE REPORT**

Judge: Hon. Karen L. Stevenson

Date: May 21, 2024

Time: 9:30 AM

Location: Courtroom 580

Roybal Federal Building and  
Courthouse

Original Complaint: Nov 3, 2023

Amended Complaint: Mar 29, 2023

County Answer: April 12, 2023

Runge Answer: April 12, 2023

Alcantara Answer: May 15, 2023

Trial (Proposed): July 8, 2025

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 26-1, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 26(f),  
2 and this Court's Order, the parties hereby submit the following Joint Report.

3 Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule 26(f), a telephonic  
4 conference was held between counsel on April 26, 2024. The telephonic  
5 conference was attended by Cooper Alison-Mayne of the Law Offices of Dale K.  
6 Galipo, counsel for the plaintiffs, and Jordan S. Stern of Hurrell Cantrall LLP,  
7 counsel for County of Los Angeles, Blake Runge, and Brenda Alcantara.  
8  
9

#### 10 **STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

11 This is a civil rights action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 and  
12 California law. This case arise from alleged violations of various rights under the  
13 United States Constitution and California law in connection with the fatal shooting  
14 of Everett Byram ("Decedent"). This case also involves the alleged false  
15 imprisonment of Decedent's wife, Plaintiff Ursula Byram, in the hours after the  
16 shooting. Plaintiffs bring state and federal causes of action for: (1) Fourth  
17 Amendment, Excessive Force; (2) Fourteenth Amendment, Interference with  
18 Familial Relationship; (3) Fourth Amendment, Unlawful Detention; (4) Municipal  
19 Liability, Unconstitutional Custom or Policy; (5) Municipal Liability, Failure to  
20 Train; (6) Municipal Liability, Ratification; (7) violations of the Americans with  
21 Disabilities Act; (8) Battery; (9) Negligence; (10) False Imprisonment; and (11)  
22 Violation of California Civil Code Section 52. Plaintiffs seek punitive damages  
23 against Defendant Blake Runge.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           **a.       Plaintiffs' Statement of the Case**

2           On February 10, 2023, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department (LASD)  
3 deputies responded to a mental health crisis involving 34-year-old Everett Byram  
4 at his residence. Deputies confronted him in the backyard where he held a blunt  
5 sword. Two deputies initially aimed non-lethal weapons at him, but Deputy Runge,  
6 arriving later, drew his firearm and fatally shot Mr. Byram, ignoring calls for non-  
7 lethal intervention. The shooting occurred while Mr. Byram posed no immediate  
8 lethal threat, being approximately 20 feet away and not advancing towards the  
9 deputies. There was no verbal warning before the use of deadly force, and the  
10 deputies failed to provide prompt medical aid, resulting in Mr. Byram's death.

14           Following the incident, Ursula Byram was detained for over seven hours  
15 without justification, along with her son. For part of this time, deputies refused to  
16 inform her of her daughter's whereabouts, leaving her with the impression that she  
17 may have been injured during the shooting. This caused Mrs. Byram significant  
18 distress.

21           The shooting violated Peace Officer Standards and Training Program  
22 (POST) standards for the use of deadly force. Los Angeles County is culpable for  
23 failing to adequately train its deputies in the use of deadly force and the handling  
24 mental health crises. The deputies' rapid escalation to lethal force, despite the  
25 availability of non-lethal options and Mr. Byram's known mental health issues,  
26 highlights a lack of appropriate training and protocols for such situations.

1 Furthermore, the county's subsequent actions, or lack thereof, effectively ratified  
2 the deputies' conduct. This incident is a stark illustration of systemic flaws within  
3 the county's policies and practices, which prioritize aggressive tactics over de-  
4 escalation and compassionate intervention in mental health emergencies.  
5

6 **b. Defendants' Statement of the Case**

7 The defendants are exploring all of the Plaintiffs' allegations and maintain that  
8 deputies acted lawfully and reasonably at all times. Defendants maintain that  
9 Plaintiff was armed with a sword, visible to deputies, while ignoring commands to  
10 drop the weapon. Thus, the force used in response was reasonable. Defendants also  
11 dispute the nature and extent of Plaintiffs' claimed damages.  
12

13  
14 **SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION**

15 This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' federal question and  
16 civil rights claims under United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. §1983 pursuant  
17 to 28 U.S.C. § § 1331 and 1343. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs'  
18 supplemental state law claims under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 as those claims arise out of  
19 the same transactions and occurrences as Plaintiffs' federal question claims.  
20  
21

22 **LEGAL ISSUES**

23 The following are among the principle issues raised by Plaintiffs'  
24 Complaint:  
25  
26  
27  
28

1           1) Whether the actions and inactions by the involved deputies were  
2 reasonable under the circumstances within the meaning of Fourth Amendment  
3 jurisprudence;

4           2) Whether the shooting interfered with Plaintiffs' right to a familial  
5 relationship with the decedent;

6  
7           3) Whether the shooting and use of excessive force against Decedent  
8 resulted from conduct that was malicious, oppressive, or in reckless disregard of  
9 his rights;

10           4) Whether the LASD has unconstitutional policies, practices, or  
11 customs that were the cause of the decedent's and Plaintiffs' injuries;

12  
13           5) Whether the LASD failed to train its deputies under the Plaintiffs'  
14 Monell claim;

15           6) Whether LASD ratified its deputies' unconstitutional actions that were  
16 the cause of the decedent's and Plaintiffs' injuries;

17  
18           7) Whether the defendants were negligent with respect to their handling  
19 of the situation, including using lethal force with Decedent.

20           8) Whether the defendants acted intentionally or with substantial  
21 certainty handled the situation, including using force against Decedent, would  
22 violate his constitutional rights and/or to prevent him from exercising his  
23 constitutional rights;

24  
25           9) Whether Defendants violated the Americans with Disabilities Act by  
26 failing to provide reasonable accommodation to Decedent, who was suffering from  
27 a mental health crisis when he was shot and killed;

1           10) Whether Defendants unlawfully detained and falsely imprisoned Mrs.  
2 Byram immediately after the shooting;

3           11) The nature and extent of Plaintiffs' damages, including punitive  
4 damages.  
5

## 6 **PARTIES & EVIDENCE**

7           Plaintiffs are Decedent's wife; Ursula Byram, and Decedent's three  
8 children: S.B. by and through guardian ad litem Timothy Byram, N.B. by and  
9 through guardian ad litem Timothy Byram, and A.B. by and through guardian ad  
10 litem Kaitlyn Humenchuk. Plaintiffs sue individually and as successors-in-interest  
11 to Decedent.  
12

13  
14           Defendants are County of Los Angeles, Blake Runge, Brenda Alcantara.

15           Key witnesses include: (1) Plaintiff Ursula Byram; (2) Blake Runge; (3)  
16 Sergeant Cory James; (4) Sergeant Matthew Pereida; (5) Deputy Juan Lopez-  
17 Munoz; (6) Deputy Brian Cervantes; (7) Brenda Alcantara.  
18

19           Key pieces of evidence include: (1) Body-worn-camera footage of the  
20 incident; (2) Los Angeles Sheriff's Department Training materials; (3) Recordings  
21 of 911 calls; (4) Dispatch recordings; (5) Pictures of scene; (6) the Los Angeles  
22 internal investigation report.  
23

## 24 **DAMAGES**

25  
26           Plaintiffs are unable to give an estimate of damages at this time. Damages  
27 will be based on the evidence presented at trial and may include both economic  
28

1 and non-economic losses. Economic damages will cover measurable financial  
2 losses, such as funeral and burial expenses, loss of financial support, and legal  
3 costs. Non-economic damages will address the emotional and personal impacts,  
4 including pre-death pain and suffering, loss of consortium, and loss of life.  
5 Plaintiffs may also seek punitive and exemplary damages, intended to punish and  
6 deter wrongful conduct, as well as statutory damages as provided by law.  
7

8  
9 An estimate of damages is challenging at this stage, but Plaintiffs are seeking  
10 damages exceeding \$10 million.  
11

## 12 **INSURANCE**

13 The County of Los Angeles is self-insured.  
14

## 15 **MOTIONS**

16 Plaintiffs do not anticipate adding any more parties or claims. The Parties  
17 do not anticipate filing motions to transfer venue.  
18

## 19 **STATUS OF DISCOVERY**

20 The Parties have been diligently engaged in written discovery, including  
21 multiple rounds of supplemental disclosures and document production.  
22

## 23 **DISCOVERY PLAN**

24 Depositions of key witnesses, including Blake Runge and Ursula Byram, are  
25 scheduled for May 2024.  
26

27 In addition to the scheduled depositions, Plaintiffs may depose EMTs,  
28 paramedics, and/or fire department members who arrived on scene to provide

1 medical attention to Decedent, additional witnesses to this incident, a person most  
2 knowledgeable regarding LASD policies and procedures pertaining to the use of  
3 force, a person most knowledgeable regarding gangs that operate within the LASD,  
4 criminalists who participated in any investigation into this incident, and witnesses  
5 with knowledge of Blake Runge's involvement in a deputy gang.  
6

7 According to Plaintiffs, subjects on which discovery may be needed include:  
8 the deputies' training, including training regarding the use of force and responding  
9 to mental health crises; the deputies' prior uses of force, if any, including any  
10 citizens' or internal complaints made against the involved deputies; LASD policies  
11 with regards to use of force complaints; LASD policies with regards to when  
12 deadly force may be used; LASD policies; the handling of evidence by LASD  
13 employees; medical treatment provided to the decedent on the scene of the  
14 incident; testimony of witnesses and involved deputies.  
15  
16  
17

18 Defendants anticipate discovery on the subjects of (1) whether the Plaintiffs'  
19 Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights were violated; (2) whether the Defendant  
20 Deputies used unreasonable force; (3) whether the County of Los Angeles can be  
21 held liable for any purported violation of Plaintiffs' Constitutional Rights under §§  
22 1983 and 1988; and (4) whether the defendant is entitled to qualified immunity.  
23  
24

## 25 **DISCOVERY CUT-OFF**

26 The Parties propose a Non-Expert Discovery cutoff of February 14, 2025.  
27  
28



**EXPERT DISCOVERY CUT-OFFS**

The Parties propose the following expert discovery cut-offs:

Expert Disclosure (Initial)	February 21, 2025
Expert Disclosure (Rebuttal)	March 7, 2025
Expert Discovery cut-off	March 14, 2025

**DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

Plaintiffs do not anticipate filing any dispositive motions in this case, but Plaintiffs will file motions in limine if the case proceeds to trial. Defendants are presently considering filing a Motion for Summary Judgment, but further review of case is necessary. Defendants will file Motions in Limine if this case proceeds to trial.

**SETTLEMENT**

a. Prior Discussions: No discussion has been taken at the time of drafting this report.

b. ADR Selection: The Parties have agreed to Richard Copeland as panel mediator. The Parties have schedule a mediation for August 19, 2024

**9. TRIAL ESTIMATE**

a. Time Estimate: The parties estimate the length of the trial at approximately five to seven court days.

b. Jury or Court Trial: Parties request trial by jury.

c. Plaintiffs anticipate calling between 8 and 12 witnesses; Defendants

1 anticipate calling 5 to 6 witnesses.

2 **TRIAL COUNSEL**

3 Dale K. Galipo will be the lead trial counsel for the Plaintiffs' case. Thomas Hurrell  
4 will be lead trial counsel for Defendants.  
5

6 **INDEPENDENT EXPERT**

7 The Parties agree that neither a discovery master nor independent scientific expert  
8 are needed for this lawsuit.  
9

10 **TIMETABLE**

11 See Appendix A, below.  
12

13 LAW OFFICES OF DALE K. GALIPO

14 DATED: May 7, 2024

15 /s/ Cooper Alison-Mayne

16 Dale K. Galipo

17 Cooper Alison-Mayne

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

19 DATED: May 7, 2024

HURRELL CANTRALL LLP

20  
21 By: /s/ Jordan S. Stern

22 THOMAS C. HURRELL

23 NICOLE G. ORTEGA

24 JORDAN S. STERN

25 *Attorneys for Defendants COUNTY OF*

26 *LOS ANGELES, DEPUTY BLAKE*

27 *RUNGE, and BRENDA ALCANTARA*  
28

**APPENDIX A: SCHEDULE OF PRETRIAL AND TRIAL DATES**  
**WORKSHEET**

<b><u>MATTER</u></b>	<b><u>JOINT REQUESTED DATE</u> <u>or PLNTF/DEFT</u> <u>REQUESTED DATE</u></b>
<b>TRIAL</b> [ ] Court [X] Jury Duration Estimate: 5–7 days	July 8, 2025, 9:00 a.m. (Tuesday)
<b>FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE</b> <b>(“FPTC”)</b> 4 wks before trial	June 10, 2025, 1:00 p.m. (Tuesday)

<b><u>MATTER</u></b>	<b><u>TIME</u> <u>COMPUTATION</u></b>	<b><u>JOINT</u> <u>REQUESTED</u> <u>DATE</u></b>
Hearing on Motions in Limine	2 weeks before trial	June 24, 2025, 1:00 p.m. (Tuesday)
Lodge Final Pretrial Conference Order, L.R. 16-7; File Proposed and Disputed Jury Instructions and Verdict Forms	11 days before PTC	May 30, 2025
File Memo of Contentions of Fact and Law, L.R. 16-4; Exhibit and Witness Lists, L.R. 16-5, 16-6 File Status Report Regarding Settlement	7 weeks before trial	May 20, 2025
Trial Brief, L.R. 16-10	1 week before trial	July 1, 2025

Last date to conduct Settlement Conference, L.R. 16-15	10 weeks before trial	April 29, 2025
Last date for hearing dispositive motions, L.R. 7	12 weeks before trial	April 16, 2025, 10:00 a.m. (Wednesday)
Non-Expert Discovery cutoff		February 14, 2025
Expert Disclosure (Initial)		February 21, 2025
Expert Disclosure (Rebuttal)		March 7, 2025
Expert Discovery cut-off		March 14, 2025